## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

DR. BART ADAMS and JOSEPHINE	)	
ADAMS, individually and as parents and	)	
next of kin of BRIAN ADAMS,	)	
	)	NO. 3:23-cv-00001
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
V.	)	
	)	
THE VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,	)	
	)	
Defendant		

## **ORDER**

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' "Motion for Leave to Exceed Page Limitation in Rule 7.01" (Doc. No. 31, "Motion"), in which Plaintiffs seek the Court's permission to exceed the 25-page limitation set forth in Local Rule 7.01(a)(3) by four pages to file a 29-page response ("Response") to Defendant's motion to dismiss at Doc. No. 24. Plaintiffs did not file a response to the Motion.

The Motion was filed on May 19, 2023. Plaintiffs also filed the Response on May 19, 2023, before the Court ruled on the Motion. Because it has not been opposed, the Motion is **GRANTED** nunc pro tunc.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ELI RICHARDSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Without implying that counsel have done anything underhanded here, the Court suggests that in the future, counsel obtain leave to file an extended brief before filing it, lest the Court think that they are presumptuous in assuming incorrectly that such leave will be granted perfunctorily merely because they happened to have already filed the extended brief. Counsel should also keep in mind that the request is, after all, for leave to file the document in the first place, and not just to have it accepted by the Court *after* it has been filed.